18th October 1927]

The number of lepers discharged or dismissed during this year were five, four for selling rice to villagers and one for beating a small boy who was suffering from tuberculosis as well as leprosy.

(g) & (h) No. Two hundred and seventy-seven lepers left the settlement from January to August 1927, compared with 502 in the same period in 1926.

[*Note.*—**An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.**]

II

LUNCH INTERVAL ON FRIDAYS.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" It will be remembered that on the 27th August last, a Muslim Member of this Council objected to the allotment of Fridays for non-official work on the ground that it would be inconvenient for the Muhammadan Members of this Council and that I then suggested that if the Muhammadan Members of the Council desired it, the House might have no objection to an adjournment of the Council on Fridays at 1 o'clock instead of at 1-30 p.m. as usual. The hon. Member, Mr. Basheer Ahmad, has since addressed a letter to me suggesting that it would be convenient to the Muslim Members of the Council if the House can be adjourned on Fridays between 12-30 and 2-30 p.m. and that if the Council so desires, it may, to compensate for the time lost, continue its sittings in the evening till 6 p.m. If this has the approval of the Members of the House generally, I have no objection to adjourn the Council on Fridays at 12-30 p.m. instead of at 1-30 p.m. and to continue the afternoon sittings till 6 p.m. on those days. I should like to hear the views of the leaders of parties on the matter." 12 noon.

* The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—" So far as the Government are concerned, I would ask your permission, Sir, to defer submitting my remarks on this point till to-morrow."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" I have no objection to the suggestion made by Mr. Basheer Ahmad."

* The RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Sir, we have no objection to the House being adjourned on Fridays at 12-30 p.m. But we are not in favour of the House sitting after 5 p.m."

III

ADJOURNMENT MOTION *RE* COLLECTIONS FOR THE POLICE SPORTS DURING HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR'S VISIT TO SOUTH KANARA.

* Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" With your permission, Sir, I beg leave to move the adjournment motion which stands in my name as follows :—

' *That the business of this Council be adjourned for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the excessive and improper collections of money by the police from the people of the district of South Kanara for the police sports at Mangalore on the occasion of His Excellency the Governor's visit to the district.* ' "

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" I second the motion."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Before I come to the conclusion whether the motion is in order or not, I wish to hear from the hon. Member who has moved this motion what he has to say as to the urgency of it."

* Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" Yes, Sir, the chief urgency in this case arises as follows :—The police force at Mangalore from the police constable upward to the Inspector of Police has collected various sums of money from the people of the district and to the best of my information, the amount so collected ranges over Rs. 9,000. The importance lies in this way ; they have collected the money from people who are concerned in criminal cases pending before the courts. Therefore it is quite necessary that some urgent steps should be taken at once to see that the administration of justice in the district in the detection of crimes does not miscarry or suffer. That seems to be the main ground and as far as I am aware, the collections in the mufassal were going on till recently because the sports were held only four or five days back. The first ground is the most important, namely, that all persons who have been holding gun licences and all those who are concerned in criminal cases have been asked to contribute for the police sports and naturally it cannot be expected that the detection of crimes or administration of justice in those cases would be properly carried on. That is the importance and the urgency for this motion."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Does the Government propose to say anything regarding the urgency of this motion ? "

* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" I submit, Sir, that the matter is no longer urgent. His Excellency's visit is over and I have ascertained that the Deputy Inspector-General of Police is enquiring into the allegations that improper collections were made. I could give no further information than that."

* Mr. T. R. VENKATARAMA SASTRIYAR :—" From what I understand the idea of the Mover seems to be that directions should be given to the police force at Mangalore for the future. If that is the case, such a matter can be brought before the Council in the shape of a resolution. It does not require to be brought in the form of a motion for adjournment to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. It may be said that the matter referred to in the motion is of a recent occurrence ; but I submit that it cannot be said to be urgent unless you are satisfied that any steps which should be taken by the Government should be taken immediately and that allowing the matter to be brought up before the Council in the form of a resolution would really make it futile. From this point of view I submit that such a motion ought not to be brought in the form of an adjournment motion. In view of the information given by the hon. the Law Member, I submit that it cannot be said to be an urgent matter within the meaning of the rule, because, as I have submitted, there is no reason to suppose that any steps that have to be taken by the Government ought to be taken immediately, nor is the matter of such a nature that if it is brought up before the Council in the form of a resolution it would defeat the very purpose of the motion."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I am much obliged to the Advocate-General for the canons of interpretation he has sought to lay down in regard to the interpretation and the meaning of the phrase 'urgent matter of public importance' found in the rule under which such motions can be brought

18th October 1927] [Mr. S. Satyamurti]

forward. If I understand him aright, he states that there must be something especially in matters of this kind which form the subject matter of such adjournment motions, for immediate action on the part of the Government in order to prevent the continuing of that wrong—I take it what he meant was future wrong—. He shakes his head . . ."

* Mr. T. R. VENKATARAMA SASTRIYAR :—" My contention was that future wrong might as well be corrected by motions brought forward before the House in the form of resolutions, and that this matter is not of such an urgent nature as to necessitate an adjournment motion."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I suggest that this matter is urgent in this sense : here the allegation is—I say nothing as to the truth or untruth of those allegations and much will depend upon the results of the enquiry that we are asking for—that responsible officers of the Government have received subscriptions from the public by intimidation and undue influence, from people against whom criminal cases are pending in the courts, in order to organize sports or something else in connexion with the Governor's visit. The urgency comes in this way : there are similar Government servants employed in other districts. There are similar events for which very likely through these police servants or their other subordinate servants Government may take similar steps for extracting subscriptions from the citizens of these districts. Now I submit that it is the clear and immediate duty of the Government, to satisfy themselves as to whether such occurrences have occurred in particular districts or not, and to put an end to them as early as possible, instead of waiting for similar wrongs to occur in each district and each time an adjournment motion being brought forward on the floor of this House.

" Only one word more and I have finished. These words 'urgency' and 'public importance' have always given some trouble to Speakers of the House of Commons and Presidents of the Legislatures in India. Generally the Speakers of the House of Commons leave the question of urgency and public importance to the decision of the House. If in the House of Commons 40 Members get up in support of a certain motion and if in this House 20 Members get up in their places, I submit *prima facie* that the matter is both urgent and of public importance. Unless therefore it appears to you on the face of the motion that it is obviously very frivolous and very trifling and far aside the purpose of the motion, I would beg of you to hold that such a motion is of an urgent nature, because similar wrongs are likely to be perpetrated in other districts. Even in the very district in which it is alleged that such wrongs have been committed, I submit it should be open to the Government now to tell their subordinates to refund the money to the people, or to make suitable reparation or to take steps to punish those people who have extracted money from the people. As regards resolutions, my hon. Friend the Advocate-General knows, as well as I do, that they may never pass through the ballot. The fact that in the contingent future a resolution may come in the ballot cannot really keep back this motion. If a motion has been ballotted it has a reasonable chance of being discussed in this House. But to say that simply because you can bring up a matter in the form of a resolution and therefore you cannot move an adjournment of the House, especially when no adjournment motion can be made, on any subject except those on which you

can bring forward a resolution before this House, does not stand to reason; and unless we are speaking on a theoretical basis, I submit there can be no subject justifying an adjournment motion of this kind. I presume that we have got to prove a *prima facie* case; and in this case I submit in all humility we have attempted to satisfy you, Mr. President, that there is a *prima facie* case for urgent action on the part of the Government to make reparation in the South Kanara district or to punish the culprits and to prevent a recurrence of such action in other districts. I therefore submit that the motion may be allowed, rather than accept the view of the Advocate-General, that the Government need not take any action in the matter now, pending the possible disposal of a possible resolution at some possible future sitting of the Council."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It was said by the hon. Member, Mr. Karant that collections have already been made. Of course he also said in the course of his speech that collections were still being made some four or five days back, but it does not appear in the motion which is presented to me. Though I am quite reluctant to give a general ruling that motions of this kind are not urgent, I think that in this particular case there is no urgency and therefore I cannot allow this motion."

* Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—"Under Standing Order 20, I wish to move for the adjournment of the House. . . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Has the hon. Member obtained my consent to move his motion? I would construe that obtaining the consent of the President means obtaining his consent before he takes the Chair."

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—"I will move it to-morrow." (Laughter.)

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"No such notice need be given."

IV

ACT ASSENTED TO BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

The hon. the President announced that the undermentioned Act which was passed by the Council received the assent of His Excellency the Governor-General on the date noted against it:—

The Madras Local Authorities Entertainments Tax Act, 1926.	30th June 1926.

V

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL.

(1)

The Secretary laid on the table a statement [a] of resolutions passed by the Madras Legislative Council during the last session and the action taken thereon by the Government.

---

[a] Printed and circulated separately.